BEST AVAILABLE CO

Application No. 09/965,206

Remarks

The various parts of the Office Action (and other matters, if any) are discussed below under appropriate headings.

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 3, 32 and 33 will be canceled, rendering the rejection moot as to those claims. Claims 1 and 30 have been amended to include a limitation formerly found in claim 3, namely that the conductive surface is substantially flat. Claims 1 and 30 also were amended to clarify that the bottom surface referred to is the bottom surface of individual cavities, and to address informalities in the claim language related to proper antecedent basis for several terms.

New claim 34 has been added. Claim 34 parallels claim 1 but is not limited to a wavefront transformer that has a defined focal point. Because this feature is not pertinent to the distinctions with regard to the applied reference, the addition of this claim is believed to be proper.

Entry of the amendments is respectfully requested.

Allowed Claims

As an initial matter, Applicant appreciates the allowance of claims 10-28 and 25-29.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-9, 19-24 and 30-33 have been newly rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 2,617,030 to Rust et al. ("Rust").

But unlike the claimed invention, Rust fails to teach or suggest a wavefront transformer having a substantially flat conductive surface with a plurality of cavities with openings in the conductive surface. As shown in Rust's FIG. 4, for example, Rust's partition plates W do not have a uniform height; their curvature means that Rust's mirror fails to define a flat conductive surface with a plurality of openings therein.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Application No. 09/965,206

Consequently, Applicant requests entry of the amendments to claims 1 and 30 and withdrawal of the rejection.

With regard to new claim 34, Applicant submits that Rust also fails to disclose, teach or suggest a wavefront transformer with a substantially flat conductive surface that transforms the shape of an incident electromagnetic wavefront relative to a reflected electromagnetic wavefront.

Telephone Interview

The undersigned asks the Examiner for a telephone interview to resolve any remaining issues concerning the allowance of this application.

Conclusion

In view of the amendments and remarks, Applicant believes that the present application is in a condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP

Christopher B. Jacobs

Reg. No. 37,853

1621 Euclid Avenue Nineteenth Floor Cleveland, Ohio 44115 (216) 621-1113

R:\Rayt\Patents\RAYVP0161\P0161US.R02.final.wpd

FAX RECEIVED

JUL 0 9 2003

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800